Remarks

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the Application.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Calamera (U.S. Patent No. 5,966,441). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Calamera teaches each and every element as set forth in the rejected claims. In particular:

Claim 1

A. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Calamera discloses, suggests or teaches, *inter alia*, the following features recited by Claim 1 of the present application:

> "means for representing **to a user** a plurality of components of a computer platform" (emphasis added)

The Examiner seems to assert this feature is allegedly disclosed by Calamera's teaching that "the computing platform may comprise any network-centric platform that includes a computing device configured to interact with user" (p. 2, section 2, ll. 4-6 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion.

The Examiner seems to rely on column 5, ll. 53-67 of Calamera for the above quote. Applicant strongly objects to the Examiner attempt to misrepresentation of what is actual being taught by Calamera at column 5, ll. 53-67. Contrary to the Examiner, Calamera teaches a network-centric platform that includes a computing device configured to interact with **a server**, not a network-centric platform that includes a computing device configured to interact with **user**, (column 5, ll. 62-64 of Calamera).

How can Calamera disclose "means for representing **to a user**" as recited in Claim 1, when the language relied upon by the Examiner does not teach interaction with the user, but teaches interaction with **a server**?

Applicant submits that the Examiner failed to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2) which states:

> "In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes invention other than that claimed by Applicant, **the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable**. The pertinence, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified" (emphases added).

Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to "designate as nearly as practicable" where Calamera discloses "means for representing **to a user** a plurality of components of a computer platform" (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 1.

Because Calamera does not disclose "means for representing to a user a plurality of components of a computer platform" as recited in Claim 1, Claim 1 is patentable over Calamera and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 2-5, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also patentable over Calamera and should be allowed.

B. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Calamera discloses, suggests or teaches, *inter alia*, the following features recited by Claim 1 of the present application:

> "means for representing to the user **interactions among the plurality of components**" (emphasis added)

The Examiner seems to assert this feature is allegedly disclosed by Calamera's teaching that "network-oriented component layer contains the underlying technology for creating encapsulated entity components that contain references to network resources located on computer networks" (p. 2, section 2, ll. 7-9 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion.

How exactly is this language supposed to teach "means for representing to the user interactions among the plurality of components" as recited in Claim 1? The language quoted by the Examiner seems to only disclose creation of encapsulated entity

components that contain references to network resources. Where is there any mention of the user is being presented with "interactions among the plurality of components" as recited in Claim 1?

Although Calamera does teach that the encapsulated entities are manifested as visual objects to a user via a window environment to facilitate interactions between the user and the computer (c. 8, ll. 22-27 of Calamera), Calamera once again does not teach about "interactions among the plurality of components" as recited in Claim 1. The only teaching by Calamera of interaction is interaction of network components with system software routines (c. 8, ll. 29-32 of Calamera). If the Examiner is relying on Calamera's interaction of network components with system software routines to disclose "interactions among the plurality of components," Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2) and "designate as nearly as practicable" where Calamera teaches that this interaction is being represented to "the user" as recited in Claim 1. Contrary to Claim 1, although Calamera teaches that encapsulated entities are manifested as visual objects to a user, Calamera does not teach representing to the user interaction of network components with system software routines.

Because Calamera does not does not teach representing to the user interaction of network components with system software routines, Calamera does not teach, disclose or suggest "means for representing to the user interactions among the plurality of components" as recited in Claim 1. Hence, Claim 1 is patentable over Calamera and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 2-5, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also patentable over Calamera and should be allowed.

C. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Calamera discloses, suggests or teaches, *inter alia*, the following features recited by Claim 1 of the present application:

> "means for **allowing the user to modify a security setting** associated with at least one of the plurality of components" (emphasis added)

The Examiner seems to assert this feature is allegedly disclosed by Calamera's c. 12, ll.

21-51 (p. 2, section 2, ll. 9-11 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion.

Although Calamera's c. 12, ll. 21-51 relied upon by the Examiner discloses associating information securely with the encapsulated network entity, Applicant submits that Calamera's c. 12, ll. 21-51 does not disclose "allowing the user to modify a security setting" as recited in Claim 1. According to the portion of Calamera relied upon by the Examiner, Calamera creates an autonomous network entity that stores sensitive information in a cryptographically secure manner (c. 12, ll. 25-28 of Calamera). Where does Calamera teach that this autonomous network entity allows "the user to modify a security setting" as recited in Claim 1?

Once again the Examiner is not complying with 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2) by not designating "as nearly as practicable" where Calamera teaches that the user is allowed to "modify a security setting" as recited in Claim 1.

Because Calamera does not does not allow the user to "modify a security setting" as recited in Claim 1, Claim 1 is patentable over Calamera and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 2-5, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also patentable over Calamera and should be allowed.

Claim 6

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Calamera does not teach, disclose or suggest "**representing to a user** a plurality of components of a computer platform; representing to the user **interactions among the plurality of components**; and **allowing the user to modify a security setting** associated with at least one of the plurality of components" (emphases added) as recited in Claim 6. Hence, Claim 6 is patentable over Calamera and should be allowed. Claims 7-9, at least based on their dependency on Claim 6, are also patentable over Calamera and should be allowed.

Claim 10

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Calamera does not teach, disclose or suggest "**represent to a user** a plurality of computer components; represent to the user **interactions among the plurality of computer components**; and **allow the user to modify a security setting** associated with at least one of the computer components" (emphases added) as recited in Claim 10. Hence, Claim 10 is patentable over Calamera and should be allowed. Claims 11-13, at least based on their dependency on Claim 10, are also patentable over Calamera and should be allowed.

Claim 14

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Calamera does not teach, disclose or suggest "**depicting interactions among the plurality of computer components**; and **allowing modification of a security setting** associated with at least one of the computer components" (emphases added) as recited in Claim 14. Hence, Claim 14 is patentable over Calamera and should be allowed. Claims 15-17, at least based on their dependency on Claim 14, are also patentable over Calamera and should be allowed.

Kindly charge deposit account no. 08-2025 for a one-month extension of time

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, fax no. (571) 273-8300 on

July 27, 2007
(Date of Deposit)

Alexander Krayner
(Name of Person Signing)

(Signature)

July 27, 2007
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

Alessandro Steinfl
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 56,448
LADAS & PARRY LLP
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
(323) 934-2300

Encls:
Postcard.